



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

question the final outcome. Remember that their victories have been achieved by a ruthless slaughter of "subjects," and as a result of a social system little less than autocracy. On the other hand, France not only has a remarkably efficient military organization, but she has, by careful diplomacy, established political friendships of far greater importance than any military organization could be.

The processes that have resulted in the *Krieg Kultur* of Germany have alienated every country in the world, excepting her weak sister, Austria-Hungary. The policies which have resulted in the esprit and vigor of the French army have established bonds of amity with the most popular nations of the world. Within the country, these policies enforce compulsory employment of Frenchmen in the managerial and executive offices and a very great percentage of the skilled labor of all the industries. They have encouraged financial policies that make her the second richest nation in the war, even despite many natural disadvantages. Abroad, she is represented by a well-trained diplomatic corps, one in which political partisanship does not establish priority to office. And so on without end.

Now, if our country is to prepare, let us face the situation calmly and prepare properly. The strongest armor is of no avail on an anæmic arm. Preparation presupposes patriotism. And patriotism means love of country. It is not nearly so necessary that we should all be trained soldiers as it is that we should become trained citizens. It is not as necessary that the wealthy classes should sacrifice their fortunes in aiding their country (if they have any intention of so doing) as it is that our economic and industrial conditions achieve a sane and healthy basis.

Preparedness means American control of American industries, not by chance, but by law. It means regulation of the money markets. It means a reorganized diplomatic service that will understand and interpret the alien's viewpoint—one in which capable men will gladly serve. It means a regulation of immigration, so that, in the event of war, our citizenry could not be dominated and menaced by foreign sympathizers. It means such things as public bath houses, schools, gymnasiums, recreation centers and playgrounds. And if, when we have corrected our internal maladies, we turn to the military, it will mean compulsory service for every young American, under federal direction. Then, and not till then, can we face the world and make them see that "strict accountability" and "watchful waiting" are the expressions of a nation prepared internally as well as externally for any crisis that may arise.

This idea of internal preparation has not, to the best of my knowledge, been given consideration by any periodical, and much less by our federal and municipal governments, and, as it seems of the utmost importance to me, I am taking this privilege of addressing it to you.

GRANT M. SIMON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LAW OR LAWLESSNESS?

SIR,—The one thing that should not be lost to sight in respect of this war is that fundamentally it is simply a question of law or lawlessness. If an individual in a community gets an idea that he can be a law unto himself, break his agreements with his neighbors whenever a self-determined "necessity" makes it expedient, and enlarge the sphere of his influence with

a shot-gun, we realize at once that there is no lasting peace or safety to the community until he is down and law is again on top.

This is just the situation in the community of nations to-day. Germany snaps her fingers at treaties and international law, and goes out with her guns to enlarge the sphere of her contemptible *Kultur*—contemptible, because any culture is contemptible which divorces itself from respect for the sacredness of law and from international comity, and weds itself to reckless military ambition. One hears sometimes the absurd suggestion that the new ideas for which Germany is contending in the conduct of this war will hereafter become a part of international law. These ideas are the mere negation of law, the bald assertion that any nation which thinks it has the power to back up such a course can spit upon any international regulation whatever. Any nation which has anything to gain from the maintenance of peaceful relations with any other nation, any nation which has anything to lose from a threatened state of international anarchy, is tremendously interested in seeing Germany defeated unless she voluntarily retires from so indefensible a position. The minimum of such a voluntary retirement would of course require three things—a withdrawal of all her troops to her own soil; the material restoration of Belgium, so far as money can do it, and the payment of a heavy penalty to all nations outraged by the lawless sinking of the *Lusitania*. As the Imperial German Government is morally incapable of doing any one of these things voluntarily, the one thing left to hope for is that she shall do them under compulsion. And if there is one thing above another that a passionate devotee of peace ought to pray for, it is that this war shall not end until she is compelled to do so. Any cessation of this war with these ends not secured will only sow the seed of another great war in the not distant years to come.

W. H. JOHNSON.

DENISON UNIVERSITY, GRANVILLE, OHIO.

AN ENGLISH-GERMAN ANSWERED

SIR,—The statement of Mr. Albert S. Horn in the August *REVIEW* that Americans are becoming pro-German does not apply to this community or to California, as I know from a wide acquaintance throughout the State. During the past six months the sentiment in favor of the Allies has become more pronounced here, and is now essentially unanimous in their favor. During the past three months I have seen and talked with many tourists from the East and Middle West. Only one among the large number has expressed pro-German sentiments. I know nothing of the change in newspaper sentiment. The New York *World's* exposures explain some things.

The spirit of the unspeakable Turk has revived of late. The practice of chasing Armenians into their villages and wasting ammunition shooting them was becoming old-fashioned and monotonous. Since they have seen German *Kultur* in action in Belgium the Turks have felt a new inspiration, recalling the glorious days of Tamarlane. Now, these friends of Germany herd Armenians in barns and churches by the thousand and burn them regardless of age or sex.

Mr. Horn seems to have migrated to the wrong country when he left England. He should have gone to Germany and joined the army. He could have helped to desolate Belgium, slaughter toiling peasants and shoot hostages for offences of people they had never seen.